IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

WRIT PETITON NO. 519 (MS) OF 2006

Kalika Prasad Nautiyal,
s/o Sri Pati Ram Nautiyal,
R/o Mohan Mandir Neshvilla Road,
Dehradun. .....Petitioner.

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal, through Secretary Dehradun.
2. Commissioner Garhwal Mandal Pauri Garhwal.
3. District Magistrate, Haridwar. .....Respondents.

Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Learned Sanding Counsel for the respondents.

Dated: 06.05.2006

Hon'ble Rajesh Tandon, J.

By the present writ petition the petitioner has prayed for a writ of mandamus commanding the respondents to include the petitioner in select list for the training of Lekhpal in District Haridwar and permit him to join the said training along with other selected candidates.

The grievance of the petitioner is that he appeared in the computer knowledge examination held on 10th February, 2006 and the result of the same was declared on the same date in which 12 candidates including the petitioner were declared successful and the petitioner was informed to appear in the physical examination held on 20.02.20006, however, another advertisement was published by the office of the respondent no. 3 and the candidates who were not declared successful

were also included later on. The petitioner appeared in the physical test, in which he has also qualified, but in the final select list, the name of the petitioner has not been shown.

The petitioner having been selected and was declared successful and thereafter, he has also completed his physical test and as such there is no occasion not to send the petitioner for training.

Regarding the aforesaid grievance, the petitioner has made a representation on 01.03.2006 (Annexure No. 9 to the writ petition), but the same has not yet been considered.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the District Magistrate/respondent no. 3 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of four weeks form the date of production of the certified copy of the order. However, in case the representation of the petitioner is decided in favour of the petitioner, he shall be sent for training otherwise respondent no. 3 shall record reasons as to why the petitioner has not been sent for training though he has been declared successful.

Writ petition is disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

(Rajesh Tandon, J.)

06.05.2006
Rathour